



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,221	01/15/2002	Jorgen Bjorkner	213854US2PCT	2170
22850	7590	04/14/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET			SHAW, PEILING ANDY	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2444	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/926,221	BJORKNER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PELING A. SHAW	2444	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 30 March 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 31-54 and 56-61.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Peling A Shaw/
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has amended claim 47 to address claim rejection under 2nd paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 as per section 7 of office action mailed on 10/26/2008. Examiner has reviewed and accepted the change.

Applicant has stated in 1st paragraph on page 11 of current amendment that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize, from at least the above-noted passage (i.e. lines 14-28 on page 3 of applicant's specification), that information sites are maintained independently form the management unit of the claimed system. Examiner has re-reviewed the passage and applicant's specification with respect to the usage of "management unit". There seems to be no usage of "management unit". However, the term of "management system" is used extensively. See lines 29-33 on page 3 of applicant's specification and also original claim 25. The term of "management system" is particularly referred to item 26, see Fig. 2. As per lines 29-33 on page 3 of applicant's specification, it seems that the information sites (web pages) are grouped into "worlds". As per Fig. 2, the management system seems to connected with the database. Thus the argued limitation of "said first information site being maintained independently form the management unit" seems not consistent with applicant's description on lines 29-33 on page 3 of applicant's specification and Fig. 2.

Applicant has argued (2nd paragraph on page 13 of current amendment) that England does not describe that either the piper server or the HTTP server is configured to identify a client that is accessing another information site related to an information site being accessed by the guide. The argued limitation is "said management unit is configured to identify a second user at a second terminal, having the client program, said second user accessing at least one other related information site of the collection of said related information sites related to the first information site". England is quoted to show the above limitation as "said management unit is configured to identify a second user at a second terminal, having the client program, said second user accessing at least one other related information site of the collection (abstract; guide/specialist, remotely loaded and displayable frames, shared whiteboard) of said related information sites containing related information associated with the internet address of the first information site (column 30, lines 46-52: client-side component is an applet to obtain information about its environment, i.e. URL and frame). However, England has shown further on the limitation of "said first terminal is further configured to receive an IP address of the second terminal form the management unit and is configured to conduct a communication from the first user to the second user based on the received IP address by way of exchange of respective IP address between the first and second terminals (column 15, lines 8-12: communication via the browser-based network among piper server 502, HTTP server 1204, guide system 1206 and client system 1208; column 2, lines 31-38: HTTP built on top of TCP/IP; column 20, lines 4-20: Remote Procedure Call interface allows two computer to communicate and send messages, the Remoteaddress is the client IP address). Examiner has further searched in England and found further reference in regarding identifying a client system (vs. guide system) as a second user (see claim 9, column 8, lines 29-34) Thus it seems that the argued limitation is disclosed by England.